UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/510,891	10/08/2004	Mika P. Mustonen	879A.0031.U1(US)	8568

29683   7590   11/24/2008
HARRINGTON & SMITH, PC
4 RESEARCH DRIVE, Suite 202
SHELTON, CT 06484-6212

EXAMINER
ROBINSON, GRETA LEE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2169	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
11/24/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/510,891	MUSTONEN ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Greta L. Robinson	2169

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *September 11, 2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,3-6,8,9,12-14,16 and 20-22* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,3-6,8,9,12-14,16 and 20-22* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *02 November 2007* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1.   Applicant's election with traverse of Group I in the reply filed on February 22,

2008 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that there would be no serious

burden for the Patent Office to examine all claims because all claims recite modification

of the address field and virtual keys. Applicant has cancelled non-elected claims and

amended independent claims 1, 6, and 14. Newly added independent claim 20 contains

language similar in scope to amended claim 1.

2.   Claims 1, 3-6, 8, 9, 12-14, 16 and 20-22 are pending. Claims 1, 3, 6, 8, 9, 12, 13,

14 and 16 were amended. Claims 20-22 were added, and claims 2, 7, 10, 11, 15, and

17-19 have status cancelled.

Drawings

2.   The drawings were received on November 02, 2007. These drawings are

acceptable.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4.   Claims 1, 3-6, 8, 9, 12-14, 16 and 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over Boroumand et al. US Patent Application Publication No.

2002/0156870 A1 in view of Henricksen *Adapting the Web Interface: an Adaptive Web*

Browser.

Regarding claim 1, Boroumand et al. teaches a method comprising: displaying a

network browser installed on an information processing device for searching,

processing and presenting information, the network browser comprising at least an

address field and virtual function keys associated with it; receiving in the address field

information relating to an address [note: paragraph 0066 "receives the HTTP request from

the user's web browser, at step 612. The request includes the URL that was constructed by the

client software"]; determining if the information entered in the address input field is a

valid server address [note: paragraph 0066-0067 "The central server then determines a

load" (i.e. ensures that the servers are available or valid, note alternate schemes

disclosed)]; and establishing a connection to a server if it is determined that the

information entered in the address input field is a valid server address; and modifying

the address field and virtual keys so as to be in accordance with a service used at the

time [see: paragraphs 0007, 0014, 0022, paragraphs 0066 and 0069-0070], wherein the

modification of the address field and virtual keys is based on alphanumeric data input of

the user in the network browser address field [note: paragraph 0072-0074; and Figure

6]. Although Boroumand et al. teach the invention substantially as cited above, they do

not explicitly teach that the modification of the address field and virtual keys is based on

alphanumeric data input of the user. Henricksen et al. teaches an adaptive web browser

in which adaptation of the web interface can be designed and implemented in many

forms, such as by user input [see: page 21, abstract; section two Adaptation, "Classes

of adaptation that can be employed by web browser include, but are not limited to those listed in

table 1"; page 22 Table 1 Adaptation Classes; also note sections 2.2 and 2.3 "In order to

support a range of device types with varying input output capabilities, as well as different modes

of interaction depending on the user's capabilities, preferences and activities, it is necessary for

the browser to be capable of dynamically adapting its interface to the context"]. It would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to have combined

Henricksen et al. with Boroumand et al. because Henricksen et al. teaches classes of

adaptation may be employed by the web browser interface through design to support an

increasing range of the web's ability. Henricksen et al. teaches the web must be able to

adapt and support a changing network [page 23 section 3.1 HTTP Support for

adaptation].

Regarding claim 3, Boroumand et al. teaches wherein the information processing device

is connected via a communications network [see: paragraph 0082].

Regarding claim 4, Boroumand et al. teaches wherein the network browser at the

information processing device is used to open a service provider's www page [note:

paragraph 0035].

Regarding claim 5, Boroumand et al. teaches wherein the input data fields on the www

page are filled out by entering information in the service specific address field [note:

paragraph 0014].

Regarding claim 6, Boroumand et al. teaches an address field with associated virtual

function keys belonging to a network browser installed at an information processing

device [note: paragraphs 0072-0074; Figure 6].

Regarding claim 8, Boroumand et al. teaches wherein said service used is one of the

following: telephone service, calculator, payment, information search [note: paragraphs

0028-0030; Figure 1].

Regarding claim 9, Boroumand et al. teaches the virtual keys of the network browser

are modified so as to make the use of the service easier [note: paragraph 0035].

Regarding claim 12, Boroumand et al. teaches a www page server connected to a

communications network ... [note: paragraphs 0039-0043, 0072-0074 and Figure 6].

Regarding claim 13, Boroumand et al. teaches wherein the address field and virtual

function keys associated with the www page are arranged to be modified ... [note;

paragraph 0051].

Regarding claim 14, Boroumand et al. teaches a communications network terminal [see: paragraphs 0022, 0050, 0100, 0101, 0106, and 0072-0074; Figure 6].

Regarding claim 16, Boroumand et al. teaches which is a terminal of a cellular network [note; paragraph 0029-0030, 0038 and 0106].

The limitations of claims 20-22 have been addressed above except for the element of a mobile wireless terminal as the device for displaying browser application [note: Boroumand et al. teaches wherein the plurality of services comprises telephone service paragraphs 0028-0030; Figure 1].

Response to Arguments

5.   Applicant's arguments filed have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In the response filed November 2, 2007 Applicant argued the prior art does not teach Boroumand et al. does not teach modification of the address field based on alphanumeric data input of the user in the network and the amended limitation of determining if the information entered is valid. In response to Applicant's argument the examiner respectfully maintains the prior art rejection citing Henricksen et al. combined with Boroumand et al. supra. Note primary reference Boroumand et al. teaches determining if the information entered is valid through the central server's load function. This procedure acts as a check to see if the servers are available. Boroumand states

various schemes may be implemented as a process for determining how to direct data

paragraphs 0066-0071. Also note Figure 3 (316) maps URLs to specific or virtual keys;

Figure 5 (514) intercepts key press; Figure 5 (520) obtain web address; and Figure 6

(618) redirect request to another server. Although Boroumand et al. teaches alternate

schemes at paragraph 0069; Henricksen et al. further discloses modification by input

[see: page 21, abstract; section two Adaptation, "Classes of adaptation that can be

employed by web browser include, but are not limited to those listed in table 1"; page 22 Table

1 Adaptation Classes; also note sections 2.2 and 2.3 "In order to support a range of device

types with varying input output capabilities, as well as different modes of interaction depending

on the user's capabilities, preferences and activities, it is necessary for the browser to be

capable of dynamically adapting its interface to the context"].

6.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Greta L. Robinson whose telephone number is

(571)272-4118. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:30AM-6:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Tony Mahmoudi can be reached on (571)272-4078. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Greta L. Robinson/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2169a
November 21, 2008